



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/757,561	01/09/2001	James A. Munro	03971.P014	1230

7590 06/05/2006

Thomas S. Ferrill
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, 7th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

SANTIAGO, ENRIQUE L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2628

DATE MAILED: 06/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 10-15, 18-23, 25, 27-29, 33-40, 42-46 and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cronin III et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,182,127 B1 in view of Microsoft Power Point 97.

-Regarding claim 1, Cronin discloses an apparatus comprising a multiple-image viewer to concurrently display multiple [~~independent~~] images within a single window (col. 3, line 65, col. 5, lines 45-54) in a network system (col. 1, line 58), the viewer enabling manipulation of each of the [~~multiple independent~~] images (col. 4, lines 37-39, col. 5, lines 45-54), at least one of the [~~multiple independent~~] images displayed being a raster graphics file (col. 5, lines 45-54, col. 6, line 52), each of the [~~multiple independent~~] displayed images having a separate [~~and independent~~] data file (col. 1, line 60 and col. 5, lines 45-54).

Cronin does not directly teach manipulation by a user of the images independently of each other, however in similar art Microsoft Power Point teaches said limitation (A user may create a presentation by starting Power Point, then selecting [Blank Presentation], from the pull down menu selecting [insert], then [picture], then [Clip Art] and inserting several clip art images. These images may be manipulated {changing size, etc} by a user independently of each other).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Cronin with the capabilities of MS Power Point, because it could be used to emphasize one image over the others.

-Regarding claim 2, Cronin discloses where the manipulation of an image consists of linking to an image (col. 6, line 6).

-Regarding claim 3, Cronin discloses where the viewer comprises a web-based application (col. 1, line 61).

-Regarding claim 4, Cronin discloses where the application is one in a group consisting of an Active-x control (col. 8, line 33).

-Regarding claim 5, Cronin discloses where the window consists of a browser (col. 1, line 65).

-Regarding claim 6, Cronin discloses where the window is defined by a page description language (HTML col.1.1, line 64).

-Regarding claim 7, Cronin discloses where the viewer comprises a computer-readable medium containing a program (col. 2, lines 6-8).

-Regarding claim 8, Cronin discloses where the network system is one in a group of a client server system (col. 2, lines 6-14).

-Regarding claim 10, Cronin discloses where the displayed image comprises a multi-resolution capability (col. 3, line 31).

-Regarding claim 11, Cronin discloses where the viewer manipulates the images as a group as well as individually (col. 8, lines 44-4).

-Regarding claim 12, Cronin discloses a module to determine which part of an image will appear in the window and then request that data (col. 4, lines 45-6).

-Regarding claim 13, Cronin discloses a module to calculate geometric coordinates of a portion of the displayed image to appear in the window and then request the block data (col. 4, lines 60-67).

-Regarding claim 14, Cronin discloses a module to display multiple images at different resolutions (col. 3, line 31).

-Regarding claim 15, Cronin discloses where the image has a hierarchical structure (col. 4, lines 50-1).

-Regarding claim 18, Cronin discloses a module to decode and display images within the window (col. 3, lines 24-26).

-Regarding claim 19, Cronin discloses a module to keep track of data in the window and data stored in cache (col. 4, lines 40-57).

-Regarding claim 20, Cronin discloses a module to scale the displayed image with data stored in a cache until the viewer decodes the data (col. 4, lines 52-57).

-Regarding claim 21, Cronin discloses a module to request data only for the displayed image to appear in the window (col. 7, lines 14-17).

-Regarding claim 22, Cronin discloses a module to request all data pertaining to image, but only to decode a portion of the data to appear (col. 7, lines 14-2).

-Regarding claim 23, Cronin discloses a module to request and decode data corresponding to an actual area of an image, blocks of data surrounding the image (col. 7, line 18), and data for one level of higher resolution (col. 3, lines 66-67).

Art Unit: 2628

-Regarding claim 25, the remarks directed to claim 15, above, apply equally to this claim.

-Regarding claim 27, Cronin discloses a predetermined setting to cause a client to request more data for the displayed image (col. 7, lines 21-24).

-Regarding claim 28, Cronin discloses where the predetermined setting is a size of the image (col. 6, line 8).

-Regarding claim 29, Cronin discloses where the predetermined setting comprises a value set at the time of the creation of the web page (col. 7, lines 21-24).

-Regarding claim 33, Cronin discloses a client having a memory (col. 3, lines 7-1), an image database (or "library") associated with the server (col. 6, line 5) and the other limitations, which were discussed in the rejection to claim 1 above.

Cronin does not directly teach manipulation by a user of the images independently of each other, however in similar art Microsoft Power Point teaches said limitation (A user may create a presentation by starting Power Point, then selecting [Blank Presentation], from the pull down menu selecting [insert], then [picture], then [Clip Art] and inserting several clip art images. These images may be manipulated {changing size, etc} by a user independently of each other).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Cronin with the capabilities of MS Power Point, because it could be used to emphasize one image over the others.

-Regarding claim 34, the remarks directed to claim 15, above, apply equally to this claim.

-Regarding claim 35, the remarks directed to claim 20, above, apply equally to this claim.

-Regarding claim 36, the remarks directed to claim 10, above, apply equally to this claim.

-Regarding claim 37, the remarks directed to claim 11, above, apply equally to this claim.

Art Unit: 2628

-Regarding claim 38, the remarks directed to claims 1 and 6, above, apply equally to this claim.

-Regarding claim 39, the remarks directed to claim 15, above, apply equally to this claim.

-Regarding claim 40, the remarks directed to claim 10, above, apply equally to this claim.

-Regarding claim 42, the remarks directed to claim 20, above, apply equally to this claim.

-Regarding claim 43, the remarks directed to claim 30, above, apply equally to this claim.

-Regarding claim 44, the remarks directed to claims 1 and 6, above, apply equally to this claim.

-Regarding claim 45, the remarks directed to claim 15, above, apply equally to this claim.

-Regarding claim 46, the remarks directed to claim 10, above, apply equally to this claim.

-Regarding claim 48, the remarks directed to claim 20, above, apply equally to this claim.

-Regarding claim 49, the remarks directed to claim 30, above, apply equally to this claim.

-Regarding claim 50, the remarks directed to claim 10, above, apply equally to this claim.

-Regarding claims 51-54, Cronin does not directly teach multiple (raster) images that are not all elements of the same image. However in similar art Microsoft Power Point 97, teaches multiple images that are not all elements of the same image (see the above rejection of claim 1). Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Cronin with the capabilities of MS Power Point, because it could be used to display different images simultaneously and to emphasize one image over the others.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2628

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9, 16, 24, 26 and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cronin III et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,182,127 B1 in view of Microsoft Power Point 97 and further in view of Knowlton et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,973,692.

-Regarding claim 9, Cronin and Microsoft Power Point do not disclose where the image has a folder with a hierarchical structure. However in similar art Knowlton discloses a directory with a hierarchical structure (col. 19, lines 17-24). Therefore at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize an image directory with a hierarchical structure in combination with Cronin and Microsoft Power Point, because it would provide an aid to the user when selecting graphics images (col. 19, line 22).

-Regarding claim 16, the remarks directed to claim 9, above, apply equally to this claim.

-Regarding claim 24, the remarks directed to claim 9, above, apply equally to this claim.

-Regarding claim 26, Knowlton discloses a subfolder ms shown in the remarks to claim 9 above.

-Regarding claim 30, Cronin and Microsoft Power Point do not disclose a predetermined setting having a value below which a representation of the object is displayed and above which the object is displayed.

However in similar art Knowlton discloses a predetermined setting having a value below which a representation of the object is displayed and above which the object is displayed (col. 17, lines 50-57). Therefore at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have a predetermined setting having a value below which a

Art Unit: 2628

representation of the object is displayed and above which the object is displayed, because it would save computer resources and provide valuable information to the graphics user.

-Regarding claim 31, Knowlton discloses an image as shown in the remarks to claim 30 above.

-Regarding claim 32, Cronin and Microsoft Power Point do not disclose a predetermined setting having a value below which the object is not displayed and above which the object is displayed. However in similar art Knowlton discloses a predetermined setting having a value below which the object is not displayed and above which the object is displayed (col. 17, lines 50-57). Therefore at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have a predetermined setting having a value below which the object is not displayed and above which the object is displayed, because it would save computer resources and provide valuable information to the graphics user.

Claims 17, 41 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cronin III et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,182,127 B1 in view of Microsoft Power Point 97 and further in view of Chui, U.S. Patent No. 5,909,518.

Cronin III et al. and Microsoft Power Point do not disclose image compression according to a block based integer wavelet transform scheme. Cronin III et al. does disclose image compression (col. 8, line 36). The applicant discloses in paragraph 50 a block-based integer wavelet transform entropy-coding scheme found in Chui (col. 2, line 60). Therefore at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a block-based integer wavelet transform entropy-coding scheme for compression. Thus one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because wavelet transform

Art Unit: 2628

is a standard data compression scheme and the type of compression scheme used would not affect the nature of the invention.

-Regarding claim 41, the remarks directed to claim 17, above, apply equally to this claim.

-Regarding claim 47, the remarks directed to claim 17, above, apply equally to this claim.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

EDIT202: PowerPoint Basics

www.quasar.ualberta.ca/edpy202/tutorial/PowerPoint/pptBasics/pptBasics.htm

Online Tutorial, pages 1-11

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2628

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Enrique L Santiago whose telephone number is (571) 272-7648. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 6:30 A.M. to 4:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark K. Zimmerman whose telephone number is (571) 272-7653, can be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:00 A.M. to 3:30 P.M.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Faxed to: 571-273-8300

Hand carried deliveries must be made to the Customer Service Window (now located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314)

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Enrique L. Santiago

May 30, 2006



MARK ZIMMERMAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600